

12-

GIFFORD PINCHOT AND CHARGES  
AGAINST THE FOREST SERVICE

---

SPEECHES AND COLLOQUIES

OF

HON. JAMES WESLEY BRYAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MARCH 12 AND MAY 15, 1914



WASHINGTON  
1914

45405—13405



12

## SPEECHES AND COLLOQUIES OF HON. JAMES WESLEY BRYAN.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13679) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

The CHAIRMAN. When this bill was last under consideration it was agreed that on the next day the bill was considered the committee should return to page 29, line 24. The Clerk will report the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chugach National Forest, Alaska, \$16,320.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close in 15 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I had rather you would wait 10 minutes. Then I think we can get an agreement.

Mr. LEVER. All right. I withdraw the request.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, I make this motion for the reason that no one has ever yet been able to explain why this reserve was created or what purpose it serves.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. BRYAN. It may be true that the limits of these reserves are subject to some kind of revision; there may be some merit to that contention. But when you come to take up here on the floor of this House a proposition of this kind, to throw out the appropriation which provides means of keeping up a forest reservation, and thus by a collateral attack throw out the whole machinery and put out of commission the whole reserve and wreck the whole plan, then the proposition becomes absolutely ridiculous, it seems to me.

This particular reservation was made by order of Theodore Roosevelt, and whether or not that order met with the approval of some of the gentlemen from Washington, nevertheless the fact remains that by that order the coal deposits of Alaska were saved to the people of this country, and I am glad that that reservation was made. I am glad that the order was given. I am glad that that coal was preserved.

We had a great deal of debate here over the Alaska railroad bill, and we accomplished what I believe to be the greatest piece of progressive legislation that has been enacted by this Congress when we enacted the Alaskan railroad bill. But if it had not been for that order reserving those coal fields, I am quite sure that all will admit that President Wilson would not have

deemed it necessary to have included in his message a request that a railroad be built up there.

\* \* \* \* \*

Now, I am glad that this Chugach Reserve has been made. And I want to say that the people out in the great Northwest indorse Theodore Roosevelt; and they indorse Gifford Pinchot in the work that he did. They indorse that conservation movement, and they are glad that work was done.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. I do not think I can. My time is about out.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman spoke about Gifford Pinchot.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I wish the gentleman would explain in connection with his statement the action of Mr. Gifford Pinchot in that transaction, where the Northern Pacific Railroad got 240,000 acres of valuable land and the Santa Fe got 1,200,000 acres of valuable land in exchange for worthless land. I would like to know about that.

Mr. BRYAN. I will say to the gentleman that lieu-land legislation was put on the statute books by the gentlemen who cooperated with my colleague, and this land was taken out through these lieu-land propositions; but Gifford Pinchot stopped that sort of thing.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I asked the gentleman to explain that proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] be given five minutes more. This is a very important matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYAN. Gifford Pinchot, in his efforts against the operations of timber looters and speculators under the lieu-land provisions that had been put into laws by the men who took the same position on this floor as my colleague now takes, interfered with those things and stopped them. I have shown here, in the remarks I made during the special session, facts and figures by which that fact can be easily demonstrated, and I say Gifford Pinchot is not responsible for the taking of that property away from the people out there.

It is true that forest reserves were first created by order of Grover Cleveland, and then by order of President Roosevelt and others; and then by cute legislation, offered on the floor here by Members, by striking out a line here and inserting a line there, they fixed it so that these lieu-land selections could be made, and so that the Government could be divested of this property, and it took active, energetic work to stop it. They said that the Government had taken in land belonging to the railroads, and that it was necessary to get the forest-reserve land in a compact body, and that it was necessary to have the railroads which had land in forest reserves give up that land and

take land on the outside; and they fixed it so that they got land on the outside without consideration of the value or location and without other safeguards which ought to have been put in, and which would have been put in if the legislation had received full consideration. By that kind of legislation they robbed the public domain.

When Gifford Pinchot and the Forestry Bureau came on the scene they attacked that line of work and interfered with it and stopped it, and they are the ones who are entitled to the credit for stopping it. Those Members of Congress from the Northwest who heretofore represented that country and failed to take up the matter in the way that they ought to have taken it up found it easy enough to come here and, by amendments like this, wipe out reserves and wipe out the improvements that had been made.

We do not want to turn Alaska over to the speculators and give them carte blanche as to these public lands, and so I urge that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] be defeated, and that we continue in the course that we have been pursuing, unless we take up the matter regularly and, upon full consideration by the department and after full discussion here, make such corrections here as may be necessary in the administration of our Forest Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask five minutes in which to reply to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to reply just briefly to some of the statements made by my colleague [Mr. BRYAN], and I want the committee to hear this statement.

The elimination of the lands from forest reserves, to which my colleague refers, I have heard about a great many times. It was probably a mistake, and ought never to have been done. But I call the attention of the House to these facts, and if my colleague now or hereafter can explain them I would be glad to have him do it.

Mr. Gifford Pinchot made a protest against this elimination which he has mentioned, and Mr. Pinchot was right when he protested against that elimination, as the results have shown since. But at that time Mr. Gifford Pinchot was connected with the Government. He was connected with it after that until he went out under President Taft's administration. Now, after this elimination of which the gentleman speaks, and while Mr. Gifford Pinchot was still connected with the Government service—

Mr. BRYAN. With the Government service, not the Forest Service.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. While he was connected with the Government service, when he was the man upon whom the President was depending for advice and information in

regard to the creation of these forest reserves, the Santa Fe Railroad received 1,200,000 acres of the best land upon all the public domain in exchange for a like number of acres of land that contained no timber and was utterly worthless, and was estimated by the railroad company at from 15 to 18 cents an acre. Why did not Mr. Gifford Pinchot protest against that exchange? He was in the service. I challenge my colleague or any other man to show where Mr. Pinchot ever protested against that steal. That is what my colleague called it. It was not what he put in the RECORD, but that is what he said. It was the greatest and most outrageous looting of the public domain in our history.

Mr. BRYAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Not just at this moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

\* \* \* \* \*

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] to strike out the paragraph in line 24, page 29.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEVER. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the ayes are 3 and the noes are 41, and the amendment is rejected. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Did the Chairman report the ayes as 3?

The CHAIRMAN. Ayes, 3.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. BRYAN. A while ago when my colleague, Mr. HUMPHREY, was speaking, I endeavored to ask him a question, but his time was so brief that he did not have an opportunity to yield to me, but said that he would yield to me later, but his time expired.

Here is what I wanted to call to his attention in connection with the remarks he was making. This lieu-land law was repealed in 1905 in part on the recommendation of Gifford Pinchot, who was not made forester until 1905. Now, this elimination that the gentleman complains of was made prior to that date, and Mr. Pinchot could not be held responsible for the elimination made prior to the time he had any responsibility or jurisdiction in the department.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. What I tried to say, and I think I did say, was that Mr. Pinchot was connected with the Government during all the time of these transactions, and he saw that elimination out in our State and protested against it. Why did not he protest against the others?

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman admits that it was none of Mr. Pinchot's duty or responsibility to protest?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, no.

Mr. BRYAN. He says a short time before, or a number of years before, he did all he could to prevent the looting of the

particular district represented by my colleague, Mr. JOHNSON, by these Standard Oil syndicates that were there; he did all he could and tried to save it. He was turned down absolutely by the authority of the congressional delegation from Washington urging Executive action. Then later on they did some more of this kind of work, and Mr. Pinchot did not protest. Now he says why did not Mr. Pinchot keep up the good work? He says Mr. Pinchot was doing mighty good work when he tried to stop the then Washington delegation.

The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], then a Member of Congress, was earnestly urging that elimination; and the gentleman from Washington now says that Mr. Pinchot did right when he protested against it. It is a fact that Mr. Pinchot was turned down at the earnest recommendation of Senator JONES. They were in direct opposition. He says Mr. Pinchot was right, and commends him, and now he complains because he did not keep up the good work, although he was not responsible, although it was not his official duty, although it was not assigned to him by any law to interfere with these eliminations.

Mr. Pinchot, as soon as he became forester, as soon as he got hold of the matter, stopped this lieu-land exchange, interfered and stopped the whole procedure, over the protest of men from the Northwest who ought to have been there protecting the public lands. Now he wants to condemn him because for a period of time he was not volunteering his services and protesting. I do not doubt he did protest all he could against those lieu-land reserves, even though it is not recorded, but it was not within his authority or power. He got fired by President Taft in the Ballinger controversy later on because of his activity, because he tried to do something. The Republican President put him out of office because of his earnestness to save these resources for the people.

#### **YOU CAN NOT SCORE AGAINST PINCHOT OUT WEST.**

I want to say that the last man in the State of Washington on whom you can score and make good a criticism, so far as conservation of the public domain is concerned, is Gifford Pinchot. You can not make good out there on criticizing him or Theodore Roosevelt either.

Tribute of President Roosevelt to the Reclamation Service and Mr. Pinchot:

ROOSEVELT PAYS HIGH TRIBUTE TO GIFFORD PINCHOT—SAYS HE IS THE MAN TO WHOM THE NATION OWES MOST FOR WHAT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED AS REGARDS THE PRESERVATION OF THE NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE COUNTRY—COLONEL STATES THAT RECLAMATION WAS THE FIRST TASK HE TOOK UP WHEN HE BECAME PRESIDENT.

When governor of New York, as I have already described, I had been in consultation with Gifford Pinchot and F. H. Newell, and had shaped my recommendations about forestry largely in accordance with their suggestions. Like other men who had thought about the national future at all, I had been growing more and more concerned over the destruction of the forests.

While I had lived in the West I had come to realize the vital need of irrigation to the country, and I had been both amused and irritated by the attitude of eastern men who obtained from Congress grants of national money to develop harbors and yet fought the use of the Nation's power to develop the irrigation work of the West. Maj. John Wesley Powell, the explorer of the Grand Canyon and Director of the Geological Survey, was the first man who fought for irrigation, and he lived to see the reclamation act passed and construction actually begun. Mr. F. H. Newell, the present Director of the Reclamation Service, began his work as an assistant hydraulic engineer under Maj. Powell; and,

unlike Powell, he appreciated the need of saving the forests and the soil as well as the need of irrigation. Between Powell and Newell came, as Director of the Geological Survey, Charles D. Walcott, who, after the reclamation act was passed, by his force, pertinacity, and tact, succeeded in putting the act into effect in the best possible manner. Senator FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS, of Nevada, fought hard for the cause of reclamation in Congress. He attempted to get his State to act, and when that proved hopeless, to get the Nation to act, and was ably assisted by Mr. G. H. Maxwell, a Californian, who had taken a deep interest in irrigation matters. Dr. W. J. McGee was one of the leaders in all the later stages of the movement.

#### GIFFORD PINCHOT, LEADER.

But Gifford Pinchot is the man to whom the Nation owes most for what has been accomplished as regards the preservation of the natural resources of our country. He led, and, indeed, during its most vital period, embodied the fight for the preservation, through use, of our forests. He played one of the leading parts in the effort to make the National Government the chief instrument in developing the irrigation of the arid West. He was the foremost leader in the great struggle to coordinate all our social and governmental forces in the effort to secure the adoption of a rational and farseeing policy of securing the conservation of all our national resources. He was already in the Government service as head of the Forestry Bureau when I became President; he continued throughout my term not only as head of the Forest Service but as the moving and directing spirit in most of the conservation work, and as counselor and assistant on most of the other work connected with the internal affairs of the country. Taking into account the varied nature of the work he did, its vital importance to the Nation, and the fact that as regards much of it he was practically breaking new ground, and taking into account his tireless energy and activity, his fearlessness, his complete disinterestedness, his single-minded devotion to the interests of the plain people, and his extraordinary efficiency, I believe it is but just to say that among the many, many public officials who under my administration rendered literally invaluable service to the people of the United States, he, on the whole, stood first. A few months after I left the Presidency he was removed from office by President Taft.

#### RECLAMATION—THE OLD, NARROW VIEWS.

The first work I took up when I became President was the work of reclamation. Immediately after I had come to Washington, after the assassination of President McKinley, while staying at the house of my sister, Mrs. Cowles, before going into the White House, Newell and Pinchot called upon me and laid before me their plans for national irrigation of the arid lands of the West, and for the consolidation of the forest work of the Government in the Bureau of Forestry.

At that time a narrowly legalistic point of view toward natural resources, obtained in the departments and controlled the governmental administrative machinery. Through the General Land Office and other Government bureaus, the public resources were being handled and disposed of in accordance with the small considerations of petty legal formalities, instead of for the large purposes of constructive development, and the habit of deciding, whenever possible, in favor of private interests against the public welfare was firmly fixed. It was as little customary to favor the bona fide settler and home builder, as against the strict construction of the law, as it was to use the law in thwarting the operations of the land grabbers. A technical compliance with the letter of the law was all that was required.

The idea that our natural resources were inexhaustible still obtained, and there was as yet no real knowledge of their extent and condition. The relation of the conservation of natural resources to the problems of national welfare and national efficiency had not yet dawned on the public mind. The reclamation of arid public lands in the West was still a matter for private enterprise alone; and our magnificent river system, with its superb possibilities for public usefulness, was dealt with by the National Government not as a unit but as a disconnected series of pork-barrel problems, whose only real interest was in their effect on the reelection or defeat of a Congressman here and there, a theory which, I regret to say, still obtains.

The place of the farmer in the national economy was still regarded solely as that of a grower of food to be eaten by others, while the human needs and interests of himself and his wife and children still remained wholly outside the recognition of the Government.

All of the forests which belonged to the United States were held and administered in one department and all the foresters in Government employ were in another department. Forests and foresters had nothing

whatever to do with each other. The national forests in the West—then called forest reserves—were wholly inadequate in area to meet the purposes for which they were created, while the need for forest protection in the East had not yet begun to enter the public mind.

Such was the condition of things when Newell and Pinchot called on me. I was a warm believer in reclamation and in forestry, and, after listening to my two guests, I asked them to prepare material on the subject for me to use in my first message to Congress of December 3, 1901. This message laid the foundation for the development of irrigation and forestry during the next seven and one-half years. It set forth the new attitude toward the natural resources in the words "The forest and water problems are perhaps the most vital internal problem of the United States."

On the day the message was read a committee of western Senators and Congressmen was organized to prepare a reclamation bill in accordance with the recommendations. By far the most effective of the Senators in drafting and pushing the bill, which became known by his name, was NEWLANDS. The draft of the bill was worked over by me and others at several conferences and revised in important particulars. My active interference was necessary to prevent it from being made unworkable by an undue insistence upon State rights, in accordance with the efforts of Mr. MONDELL and other Congressmen, who consistently fought for local and private interests as against the interests of the people as a whole.

June 17, 1902, the reclamation act was passed. It set aside the proceeds of the disposal of public lands for the purpose of reclaiming the waste areas of the arid West by irrigating lands otherwise worthless, and thus creating new homes upon the land. The money so appropriated was to be repaid to the Government by the settlers and to be used again as a revolving fund continuously available for the work.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do it for the purpose only of calling attention to the difference in the administration by the State of Washington and the Government of their forests in our State. Mr. Gifford Pinchot, in an article in Pearson's Magazine of May 19, 1913, states that the State of Washington up to the time of which he writes had received from forest service \$115,205. Of course, like they always do, he tells us that some time we are going to get an amount equal to our loss of taxes. I called the attention of the House to the fact some time ago that if we were to tax timber in the forest reserves in our State at the same rate we tax private timber we would get between five and seven million dollars. The State of Washington has about 2,000,000 acres of timberland and the Government has 12,000,000 acres of timberland in our State. I am not especially complimenting the conduct of the State forest service, but out of the 2,000,000 acres there are about 666,000 in the national reserves that the State is permitted to use. Yet the State has already accumulated a fund of \$12,000,000 from that part of the 2,000,000 acres it has been permitted to handle. The Forest Bureau, which has 12,000,000 acres, makes \$14,500 a year. That is the difference between the two.

If the forests in my State were properly administered they would pay the entire expenses of the Forest Service, great as it is to-day, amounting to something over \$5,500,000, and at the same time pay into the National Treasury from \$2,000,000 to \$3,000,000 a year. I cited the illustration of British Columbia, where their forests make net the sum of \$3,000,000 a year. The people of the State of Washington are asked to be very thankful because the Forest Service can take one-third of our State and keep it out of taxation and sell timber off it at the rate of 1 cent an acre, because they so run it that they would cut over it once in 35,000 years, if they continue at their present rate, and because we receive the munificent sum from it of

\$14,500 a year. That is what we get for all this vast amount of land that is taken out of taxation.

Mr. PAYNE. What does the gentleman mean by taking it out of taxation?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I mean it is not taxed.

Mr. PAYNE. Does not the gentleman know it belongs to the United States Government, and why should it be taxed?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I suppose the gentleman knows I am saying what the tax would be if taxed the same as private holdings. Why is not that timber worth as much to the Government, if properly controlled, as to anyone else?

Mr. PAYNE. When the gentleman talks about mismanagement that is one thing, but he always winds up with the statement that it is not taxed for the benefit of his State.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Because the Forest Service, as well as Mr. Pinchot in his article referred to, has repeatedly promised that if we will just be patient the 25 per cent we get from the sale of the timber on the forest reserves will take the place of what the tax would be if we were given control of the reserves.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know what Mr. Pinchot has to say about that. He has nothing to do with it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. In other words, I am making this point, that if the State of Washington could control that timberland, or if private parties controlled it, it would be worth, without in any way decreasing the original amount, cutting only the natural increase, between \$5,000,000 and \$7,000,000 a year.

Mr. PAYNE. And in spite of that the gentleman voted to build a railroad in Alaska to be run at Government expense.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is to be within a forest reserve.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague has made this statement repeatedly. He made practically the same statement in a magazine article, published in American Industries:

Their records in the State of Washington demonstrate that during the last 10 years they took \$75,000,000 and gave in exchange \$115,000.

The gentleman has asserted that if the timberland in the forest reserves were taxed in our State, our State would get the munificent sum of \$75,000,000, whereas we have gotten only \$115,000 from the Forest Service. Seven million five hundred thousand dollars a year that we would get in the State of Washington for taxes, if the timber was only in private hands, if only the big timber barons owned that land instead of Uncle Sam. I have here the record of the meeting of the Tax Commission of the State of Washington in 1912. The State taxes for general purposes under the whole tax levy amounted to \$5,819,449. That was apportioned among the several counties of the State. The taxes on the railroads, on the timberlands, on the farm lands, on the banks, on the buildings, on the street railways, on the live stock, on the merchandise in the stores, on the mills, on the factories, on the mines, on the newspapers, on the steamboats, on all the franchises, and on all the property of the State of Washington combined amounted to only \$5,819,447, and yet

my colleague repeats, and has repeated it twice on the floor to-day, and has published it in this magazine article some months ago, that if this timber had been in private hands, in other words, if the Weyerhaeusers owned it, or the Polsons owned it, or if the big timber mills down there at Aberdeen, in the district of my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON], only owned it, we would get \$7,500,000 a year extra. But the figures show that the combined taxes levied by the State tax commission for all purposes for 1912 was less than \$6,000,000.

The sum of \$6,000,000 exceeds the entire State tax, and is considerably less than this \$7,500,000 referred to by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]; but in this \$6,000,000 are included innumerable other things besides this timber.

Timberland is only a small fraction of the assets of the State, the taxable assets, so that the statement that \$7,500,000 would have been derived from that timber is absolutely absurd and can not be figured out by any system of mathematics or the reasoning of any intelligent man. My time has about expired, and I ask unanimous consent to set forth this data more definitely in the RECORD.

In the closing paragraph of the article by Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington is the following:

Yes: they are helping the schools. Their record in the State of Washington demonstrates it, for there, during the last 10 years, they took \$75,000,000 and gave in exchange \$115,000. Great is conservation, as it has been practiced by the Forest Service!

We will just lop off the \$900,000, almost a million you will note, in order to be magnanimous with the gentleman.

According to the fourth biennial report of the State board of tax commissioners for the period ending September 30, 1912, the entire assessed value of all property in the State of Washington subject to taxation was \$1,005,086,251. The total assessed value of all the privately owned timber in the State was at the same time \$89,379,888, or about 9 per cent of the entire assessment.

It will be seen from the following excerpt from the official proceedings of the State tax commission of Washington that the total State taxes assessed for all purposes in the State in 1912 was \$5,819,449:

On motion, the State tax for general purposes, amounting to \$1,236,256; for State school purposes, amounting to \$1,909,664; for military fund, amounting to \$110,559; for permanent highway fund, amounting to \$1,005,086; for public highway fund, amounting to \$502,543; for University of Washington, amounting to \$477,416; for Washington State College, amounting to \$326,653; for Cheney State Normal School, amounting to \$90,458; for the Bellingham State Normal School, amounting to \$90,458; for the Ellensburg Normal School, amounting to \$70,356, making a total of \$5,819,449, was levied and apportioned among the several counties of the State as indicated by schedule E of this report.

If the timberland assessment is 9 per cent of the total of the entire assessed values of the State, then the timberland would pay 9 per cent of this \$5,819,449, or \$525,750.49. In other words, the State of Washington collects from all its timberlands under private ownership an annual tax of a half million dollars. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] says the State of Washington would collect \$7,500,000 from the forest-reserve areas annually if these reserves could only get into private hands.

The statement is absurd beyond all consideration even if only one year be considered. He says the people of Washington would collect fifteen times as much from the timber that is not in private ownership as from that in private ownership, but the gentleman to compound the absurdity and wild inaccuracy of his figures says the State has suffered this loss of \$7,500,000 each year for 10 years, making a grand total loss of \$75,000,000. In 1905, just seven years earlier, the total assessed value of all taxable property in the State of Washington was \$328,542,525, which is \$676,543,726 less than in 1912. Those who know are aware that in those good old days, when the Puget Mill Co. had such supreme power over the officers who collect the taxes, that timber was very much under assessed. Anyone with ordinary intelligence can see how absurd the statement of my colleague, Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington, is. Ten years ago I feel safe in saying that the State did not collect \$2,000,000 per year from taxes from all sources. Yet the gentleman says we lost \$7,500,000 per year just because this timber was held by Uncle Sam.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. BRYAN. My colleagues would do well to ponder a little on the words of their leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The good old days are gone, and gone forever. Uncle Sam has been generous to the few lucky men who were cunning enough, lucky enough, or shrewd enough to get the timber in such tremendously large quantities into their own private hands in the West. The two gentlemen from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. HUMPHREY] have practically stood alone here to-day in their assaults upon the "dreaming" Pinchot. Not another man on the floor of this House, except the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], has lent any encouragement to their assaults on the Pinchot brand of conservation. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said, these timber resources belong to the people and the time of their exploitation has passed.

These Government forests are a part of the Federal system of public ownership. We are going to own the coal in Alaska and the railroad in Alaska, and we are going to do some more things in this Republic that will startle this fast vanishing race of politicians. "You can not fool all the people all the time," and you had as well give up the game. How long will a man last in this day and time who stands up before the people and proposes that the public give away valuable timber reserves so the property will become subject to taxation? That kind of nonsense will not go any longer.

May 15, 1914.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, on the 12th of last March I took part on this floor in what I supposed were the preliminaries of a campaign of real accomplishment for the people of this country. The story of the marvelous power of radium had startled the world, as cure of cancer was added as one of its inestimable properties. The price of this most precious of all precious metals soared to the unthinkable sum of \$4,000,000 an ounce, or more than \$1,000,000,000 for 16 pounds of 16 ounces each. Asia, South

America, and Africa had been explored without encouragement of finding deposits of pitchblendes or carnotite or other ores containing radium. In Bohemia and Saxony and Russia private interests had gained control of these deposits. In Cornwall and the Trenwith mine, near St. Ives, the British Radium Corporation (Ltd.) held sway. The Cornish mine of South Terras, near Grampound Road, unique in that it had been worked in the past solely for uranium ore, was owned by the Société Industrielle de Radium.

The Canadian Government on that same 12th of March had declared, among other things—

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA,  
*Thursday, the 12th day of March, 1914.*

HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL:

\* \* \* \* \*

And whereas it would appear to be to the public interest that radium, which means and includes all deposits of carnotite, pitchblendes, or other ores containing radium in sufficient quantity for commercial extraction, the property of the Crown, should be for the present withdrawn from disposal:

Therefore His Royal Highness the Governor General in Council, under and by virtue of the provisions of section 37 of the act 7-8 Edward VII, chapter 20, is pleased to authorize the minister of the interior to withdraw from disposal and to reserve to the Crown all rights within the said Provinces and territories to radium, and to other minerals which may contain radium in sufficient quantity for commercial extraction.

RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,  
*Clerk of the Privy Council.*

That the Government of the United States was rich beyond the wealth of Cræsus in radium in the carnotite found in the sandstone of Colorado and Utah was heralded from ocean to ocean. The whole world turned its attention this way. Speculators who wanted to profit by the find were flocking to the grounds to take from the people and appropriate to themselves this inestimable wealth.

A great and progressive Secretary of the Interior—unfortunately astride a lazy and halting donkey—sounded the alarm and begged the powers that had authority in this country to act for the people. Had there been a Theodore Roosevelt in the White House, with the forward command of a progressive party to spur him on, the radium areas would have been withdrawn and the people would still be the proud owners of these resources. But upon carefully scanning the Democratic platform it was learned that there was nothing in that document about radium; and, as the President told the suffragists, he could not start anything that the platform had not mentioned. So the President said nothing about radium. Secretary Lane again warned the Members of Congress, and the gentleman from Illinois, Dr. FOSTER, introduced a resolution withdrawing from private entry the affected areas. The Public Lands Committee wanted to get this resolution, but Dr. FOSTER wanted it to go to his committee—the Committee on Mines and Mining. The question of reference was the preliminary struggle referred to in the first of these remarks. The House stood by Dr. FOSTER and his committee got the resolution. A similar resolution has been pending all this time in the Senate. What has been accomplished toward withdrawing those lands? Absolutely nothing. If Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot had moved after that fashion the coal of Alaska would to-day be

the property of the Guggenheims instead of the property of the people.

If any Member wants to discover one just cause of popular distrust of Congress by the people, let him read the House and Senate hearings on this radium proposition and ponder over the fact that Congress has done absolutely nothing while these lands have been entered in Colorado and Utah by private persons for private purposes at such a rate that all the best claims are now gone. The whole proceeding is nothing short of shameful. When Gifford Pinchot recommended the withdrawal of the principal Alaska coal fields and President Roosevelt followed his advice, Mr. Pinchot became the subject of every conceivable slander and abuse by a band of men who wanted to appropriate those lands. Because he saved these coal lands for the people and had stopped lootings of the public domain by railroads and timber syndicates he incurred the enmity of all who had heretofore profited by the loose way in which public-land matters had been administered.

In recent debates on this floor Mr. Pinchot has been falsely accused by a Representative from the State of Washington in this connection. In substance it has been declared that he was responsible for all the frauds perpetrated under the lieuland law he did not succeed in preventing, on the theory that if he could prevent one fraud he ought to have been able to prevent all. He has been denounced in particular because he did not stop the railroad raids on the public domain, although he was not in any official position where he could regulate such matters at the time; but it is said that he stopped some of these things by extra-official warnings. Take the Santa Fe Railroad exchange, for example, about which my colleague from the State of Washington has denounced Mr. Pinchot. This exchange was managed entirely by the Department of the Interior. Mr. Pinchot was in the Department of Agriculture. He had no responsibility of any sort, shape, or kind in connection with it. Mr. Pinchot was given charge of the national forests in 1905. The Santa Fe exchange was made several years before that time.

He has also been accused of allowing the Santa Barbara Water Co. to exchange 63,000 acres of the public domain for land they themselves estimated at 25 cents an acre, and it has been stated on the floor of this House that Mr. Pinchot indorsed the transaction. The fact is that he investigated the disposal of the Santa Barbara lands and the claims that these lands, then owned by private interests, were needed by the public for a watershed. He reported that these lands were needed and ought to be acquired by the Government, stating in his letter of approval that he did not know what lands were to be accepted in exchange, but understood that lands in the Dakotas were to be exchanged. Yet it is charged that he approved in this letter of an exchange of the Santa Barbara lands of the Government for certain worthless lands. The simple truth is he did not do anything of the sort.

The State of Washington and the great Northwest owe to Gifford Pinchot a debt of gratitude which can never be paid, and I am unwilling to have these unfounded charges go unchallenged. They do not contain the slightest merit. The plain people of the Northwest love Mr. Pinchot and stand by him in

every argument, but there is not a land crook or a crooked land lawyer on the Pacific coast that does not hate him with all the pent-up hatred of a disappointed highwayman.

Mr. Pinchot is now a candidate for the United States Senate from the State of Pennsylvania, and these charges made here on this floor by a Representative from the State of Washington have been widely circulated and exploited in the public press and in public documents in the State of Pennsylvania to make false impressions there and deprive him of that support to which he is entitled.

As a Representative of the State of Washington in this Congress, I say that Gifford Pinchot has the confidence of the people of my State, and I wish it were possible for my word to reach every man who has gained a false impression from these widely published charges. I would say to them all that Mr. Pinchot is entitled to the highest credit and to unstinted praise for his service in stopping the land frauds against the people of the United States in the great Northwest.

In order that he may not at any time in the future be wrongly charged in connection with the disgusting fall-down of the executive arm of this Government first and the legislative arm second in this radium matter, I call to the attention of Congress the following warnings that have been sent out recently by Mr. Pinchot on this subject:

NATIONAL CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,  
COLORADO BUILDING,  
Washington, D. C.

As president of the National Conservation Association, Gifford Pinchot gave out the following statement with regard to the Foster radium bill for the Federal control of radium lands:

"Every friend of conservation will indorse with keen satisfaction the efforts of the Secretary of the Interior and of Congressman FOSTER, of Illinois, to safeguard the remaining radium lands now in public ownership from monopoly and exploitation by private interests. The bill recently introduced by Mr. FOSTER (H. R. 12741) is not only a conservation measure of high importance but also a great humanitarian measure. This bill will effectively conserve the remaining radium-bearing ores on the public domain and at the same time will encourage legitimate development. It should have the support of every conservationist.

"What is of still greater importance, Mr. FOSTER's bill will devote to public uses all of this invaluable curative mineral now publicly owned and will defeat the efforts of private corporations to monopolize it for their own private profit. Recent experiments indicate how priceless is radium in the fight against cancer and other diseases. In view of this fact the people of the country will have neither sympathy nor patience with the special interests which are seeking to exploit these natural resources for their own selfish advantage.

"The passage of this bill will be a long step forward in the application of natural resources to conserving human life and in promoting human welfare, and will mark one more victory in the age-long fight against disease. Secretary Lane hit the nail squarely on the head when he said:

"The issue is believed to be one of life and death to hundreds of thousands, and I believe the American people will support any broad-gauged policy that aims to extract from lands now in public ownership sufficient American radium for American hospitals, that thus the poorest patients may secure promptly the treatment now necessarily limited to the selected few."

"The Foster bill should have the support and indorsement of every conservationist. On behalf of the National Conservation Association I strongly urge its passage."

On March 23, 1914, Gifford Pinchot, as president of the National Conservation Association, issued the following statement:

More than two months have elapsed since a joint resolution was introduced in Congress to reserve to the people of the United States

the radium-bearing ores on the public lands. During these two months of needless and inexcusable delay not less than 500 additional claims have been located by private persons, so that their content of radium—the only medical remedy for cancer—may be exploited for private profit instead of being used for the public good. This was the object of those who caused the delay.

It is officially estimated that the loss to the Government on the radium needed for its hospitals and the profit to the grabbers, if the grabbers have succeeded fully in their purpose, will be more than \$1,500,000. But this is the smallest part of the loss.

At present at least half of our radium goes abroad. Our Government hospitals need 30 grams of radium at once, while 2 grams is all we have in the United States to-day. There are constantly in this country over 200,000 persons suffering from cancer, of whom not less than 75,000 die each year. One woman dies of cancer out of every eight that die at ages over 35, and one man out of every twelve.

The brutal callousness of the men in Congress and out who by delaying this bill have delayed relief to this army of sufferers, for the sole purpose of extracting an exorbitant profit from their necessities, makes even the offense of the food poisoners look mild and small.

Obstruction by the radium lobby and their friends in Congress could not, however, last indefinitely. After delaying for two months a bill which should have passed House and Senate in two days the grabbers saw that the bill must soon be acted on. Accordingly, secret preparation was made to have it passed in a form that would appear to give the public what it needed, yet which would leave the grabbers in substantial control of the situation.

On March 16 the Walsh bill was reported with amendments which were never discussed in any public hearing nor in any conference with the friends of the measure, and which makes the bill a fraud upon the people of this country. One of these amendments provides that if the Government fails at any time to purchase radium ore tendered to it at any railroad station and derived from any claim reserved for Government use under the bill, and does it just once, then the Government loses forever all right to buy the radium from that claim and from all contiguous claims in the same ownership. As to those claims, the bill is repealed. Congress may fail to appropriate money enough to buy the ore, carelessness, accident, or collusion may intervene—no matter what the cause, if the Government fails just once, the radium monopoly gets the claims free from all control. For, utterly incredible as it may seem, the Government officers are thereupon by this bill debarred from going upon the claims to see that the law is obeyed.

It would seem as if the cynical impudence of monopolists could reach no further. Yet the bill contains another clause, under which all that is necessary to take the radium ore in any claim out from under the provisions of the bill, out of the reach of the Government, and into the sphere of the grabbers, is for the locator of that claim not to know when he locates it that it is valuable for radium. The effect of such a provision needs no pointing out.

Another Senate amendment requires the Secretary of the Interior to pay for radium ore, not a just price but the "market" price. The "market" price of radium is an excessive monopoly price to-day. There is no reason to expect that the "market" price of radium ore, fixed by the same men, will be anything but an excessive monopoly price also. This amendment simply authorizes the grabbers to make the Government pay substantially whatever price they may choose to require.

The Senate amendments to the radium bill are simply infamous. They make it a weasel bill, which withdraws from the people the benefits it pretends to give, and it does so in the interest and at the behest of men who are preventing the relief of human misery, in order to make money out of it.

If this radium bill passes in its present form, every man who votes for it will write himself down the servant of special privilege in one of its most abominable forms. It is such cases as this that supply the reason, and so far as they go the good and sufficient reason, why so many people believe that the political power of private monopoly in Congress is stronger than the obligation of the public good, even when the saving of human life is at stake.